

The "they're all in it together" rebuttal canard

 Send to Kindle



I am among a relatively small group of independent researchers and journalists who question the proposed multipolar world order. One of the objections often thrown my (and our) way—by those who presumably support a new world order led by the BRICS+ group of nations—is that we critics of multipolarity are claiming, with regard to national governments, that “they’re all in it together.”

Having never once made that argument, constantly refuting it is very annoying. So let me outline why the “they’re all in it together” rebuttal is a canard.

Essentially the “all in it together” response runs something like this: *By only highlighting all the areas of agreement between East and West you are overlooking the very real geopolitical differences and conflicts between the two. You are claiming Putin is a WEF stooge and that Xi is a puppet of the White House. We only need to look at their statements and foreign policy commitments to know this isn’t true. Yours is a*

ridiculous argument, you stupid "they're all in it together" proponent. Obviously you couldn't be more wrong.

While making this repost suggests the defenders of multipolarity haven't read anything we've written—or have deliberately misinterpreted it—it is not a cogent argument in any event. It needs to be exposed.

The multipolar world order (MWO) is touted as a potential antidote to the current, claimed, international rules based order or system (IRBO). The IRBO emerged as the Western-led consensus on international relations under the "unipolar world order," headed by the US / NATO alliance of nations states. The IRBO and unipolarity dominated geopolitics following the collapse of the Soviet Union.

The IRBO—and the unipolar world order—is predatory and serves the economic and geopolitical interests of Western developed nations, at the cost of everyone else. It has allowed the West to instigate, sponsor and engage in conflicts all over the world. The IRBO aligned nation states pillaged resources, installed puppet governments and exploited weaker nations as they liked. The IRBO is little more than a neocolonialist project of a public-private empire. There are no actual rules beyond "might is right."

On this we can all agree. There's nothing worth defending with regard to the IRBO.

The problems begin when you start pointing out that the MWO is not, in fact, an antidote to the IRBO. It is the evolution of the IRBO. Multipolarity is virtually an enabling act for a new system of global oppression and the transition to a new global economic model.

This is flatly denied by MWO advocates. The argument between MWO backers and opponents appears to be rooted in a dispute over the nature of oligarchy.

Hitherto, the numerous attempts by a global oligarchy to construct a "new world order" (NWO) were fiercely criticised by almost the entire Western "independent media." The "global" reach of oligarchs—who care little for nation

states—was consistently exposed and reported. Thoroughly researched historical evidence was published, and frequently cited, demonstrating that global power networks, combining both public and private institutions, existed above and beyond national government control.

Now, in the West, some segments of the so-called “independent media” are claiming that oligarchs do not manipulate “all” nation states. Certain countries, such as China, India, Iran and Russia, have allegedly brought their oligarchs to book to reestablish politician-led governmental authority over their respective polities.

Instead, the MWO pushers claim, we are witnessing the “return” of political realism. Apparently, that realism no longer includes analysis of oligarch influence.

The BRICS+ led nation states are opposing the rules of Western oligarchs. This supposedly explains why they want a MWO founded upon adherence to an allegedly real system of international law and multilateral decision making. The governments of these countries are no longer willing to suffer the tyranny of the Western oligarch-led IRBO.

Or so we are told.

It seems like a dwindling number of us in the “independent media” maintain that a “global public-private partnership” (G3P), controlled by a global network of oligarchs, still exists and is still intent upon establishing its NWO. We are Luddites because we keep banging on about the “fact” that certain policy commitments are common to all countries. No matter which side of the IRBO/MWO fence they sit.

All governments, in all major economies, are avid enthusiasts of SDGs, biosecurity, digitalisation, tokenisation, the censorship of “disinformation,” CBDC (digital money), population surveillance and, most crucially, global governance under the auspices of the United Nations (UN). We who criticise

multipolarity, suggest these policy commitments can be viewed as the pillars of the modern NWO.

Further, the tiny band of MWO critics point out that agreement on the pillars, insisting they are all necessary, is practically unanimous among UN member states. What remains appears to be horse trading over who leads the MWO and how pillar policies will be implemented in respective nation states. Evidently, what is never up for debate is *not* implementing the pillars.

This suggests oligarchs exert external influence upon international relations, potentially leading to conflict. There is evidence of supranational sovereignty and political authority being exercised, right now, by a global network that operates beyond the reach of national governments.

"No, no, no" proclaim multipolarity's advocates. No such evidence exists. Such oligarch control may occur but it only impacts the West.

All we need do is look at Ukraine or the the Middle East to see the very real conflict between East and West. When we look at the statements of people like Vladimir Putin, it is obvious that he is among the global leaders who oppose the Western-led IRBO and global control by "Western" oligarchs. The realpolitik tensions between adversarial nation states couldn't be clearer. The BRICS+ nations are opposed to oligarchy. The MWO proposed by Putin and his fellow BRICS+ leaders is intended to deliver a better world.

MWO defenders absolutely deny that nearly all governments want to implement the pillars of the NWO and support the same global governance system, regardless of how blatantly obvious it is. And if it is true, they say, it doesn't matter anyway. The MWO is how we will all defeat the IRBO—which is all that matters—and build a global community of sovereign nations states who will make fairer, multilateral global governance decisions.

The idea that "they're all in it together" is preposterous, they claim. East and West are fighting each other for heaven's sake, you fool. Get behind the right political leaders promising peace and stop doubting the good guys.

This rebuttal is like claiming that professional boxers beating each other to a pulp proves the pugilists are determined to resist the international boxing federation. It is tantamount to asserting that boardroom backstabbing is evidence that the corporate executives, enriched by the success of the company, are intent upon undermining the corporation they all profit from.



The A-Team - you can trust them

Not only is this geopolitical analysis predicated upon the idea that *some* politicians are suddenly trustworthy, and everything *they say* somehow constitutes evidence, it completely dismisses everything we have learned from historical researchers like Norman Dodd, Antony C. Sutton, Carrol Quigley, G. Edward Griffin, Patrick Wood and many more. It is as if history is no longer relevant.

No one who criticises multipolarity denies the reality of geopolitical competition; none of us think violent conflicts and wars between nation states and their proxies aren't real; not a single voice, warning against the MWO, thinks people aren't being killed as governments fight for supremacy and no one is arguing that governments are "all in it together"—assuming "it" refers to the creation of a multipolar world order.

Quite evidently, there is very real and bitter conflict between nations and it is causing immense suffering. In fact, one of our chief concerns is that the transition to a MWO will cause significantly more suffering.

What we are saying is that there is no disagreement on the pillars from any quarter. But this is no claim that national governments are “all in it together.” On the contrary, the fact that there is both conflict and, at the same time, global agreement on the pillars, suggests a “geopolitical reality” that no member of the multipolar fan club seemingly wants to discuss.

Agreement on the pillars does not suggest all national governments are of one, single hive mind. It suggests that governments do not control the global governance system. They are subject to it, just like the rest of us. The best they can achieve is “partner” status. And they are not senior partners.

The pillars did not originate with national governments. The pillars were mapped out by public-private globalist think tanks and international organisations that serve the interests of oligarchs.

As the Chinese government openly declares:

China maintains that for the world, there is only one system, which is the international system with the United Nations at its core, that there is only one order, which is the international order based on international law, and that there is only one set of rules, which is the basic norms governing international relations based on the purposes and principles of the UN Charter. China actively participates in and leads the reform of the global governance system.

This “leadership” is transitioning the world to precisely the global governance system, replete with its SDGs, CBDC (digital money), surveillance, censorship and centralised global control of all nation states, that the oligarchs want. It is a bid to install the latest iteration of the “New World Order.”

This is also the global tyranny that, until very recently, nearly every Western commentator in the “independent media” was warning against.

Now, a growing chorus is suggesting we should accept the MWO because it will allegedly defeat the IRBO. This is a false dichotomy and a propagandist trap.

The IRBO is undoubtedly on its way out, but global oligarch networks haven't suddenly vanished. Far from it. We only need look at recent events to see who is actually profiting from them. The IRBO's demise is necessary for the birth of the MWO, and through it, establishment of the oligarch's NWO global governance technocracy.

The irony is that the Eastern independent media—where it exists—continues to question the oppression of global governance and remains highly critical of it. Yet some in the Western independent media seem pathologically averse to even acknowledging, let alone reporting, criticisms made by Russian independent commentators, for example.

As multipolar advocates claim that none of this is true, then I ask them to provide some evidence of one major economy that is not erecting the pillars. Can the MWO campaigners please explain how it is possible that all leading economies are pursuing the same policy platforms, simultaneously, without centralised, global coordination and policy control?

As multipolar supporters rightly point out, governments from East and West are evidently at loggerheads on numerous issues. They do not agree and they are not "all in it together."

So why are they all implementing the same pillar policies? Where is the global policy coordination coming from if not from antagonistic "sovereign" nation states?

We who question multipolarity do not believe that any system of global governance can possibly serve the interests of humanity. Such a system is, by default, designed to benefit oligarchs, not the people.

Yes, the conflicts are all too real, but they are clearly battles for position within one, agreed and accepted global governance system. The NWO pillars are already being put in place in nearly every nation state because governments are

beholding to their oligarchs. While oligarchs occasionally disagree amongst themselves, the global network of oligarchs want their NWO technocracy above all else.

Criticising the MWO is met with denial, refusal to debate and strawman arguments. It is false to allege that the critics of multipolarity assert that all governments are “in it together.” Governments are subservient to a global governance hierarchy they don’t control.

The oligarch’s NWO is being sold to us as the multipolar world order and, for some reason, it is receiving widespread support from sections of the Western independent media.

There is no need to subscribe to read my Substack posts and there are no inducements or advantages for being one of my paid Substack subscribers. So why bother?

I need your support if I am going to continue to research and write full time. So, if you think my work is worth it, I hope you will consider becoming one of my paid Substack subscribers. If that’s too much, you can always donate to “buy me a coffee” [via my website](#) if you like.

All the best.